1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10	SHARON NESS, individually,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C10-5111 KLS
12	v.	ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION
13 14	LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT AGENCY (LESA); PIERCE COUNTY; CITY OF TACOMA; et al,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	The Defendants scheduled the discovery deposition of the Plaintiff for July 27, 2012.	
18	The undersigned was attending a conference the week of July 23 rd and therefore unable to rule on	
19	the Plaintiff's motion for a protective order as it pertained to her discovery deposition. ECF No.	
20	40. Upon reviewing the pleadings, the Court notes that the Defendants agreed not to conduct the	
21	deposition on the scheduled date if there was no ruling from this Court regarding the Plaintiff's	
22	motion.	
23	First, the Defendant notes that the Plaintiff failed to file a certification required under	
24	Local Rule CR 26(c)(2) regarding a meet and confer. The chain of email provided to the Court	

shows the parties were discussing the issue and, therefore, for purposes of this motion only, the Court will infer a conference of the parties. The undersigned will make no such further inferences regarding discovery in this case. The issue regarding the deposition is whether the Plaintiff's deposition should start at 9:00, which the plaintiff opposes, or whether it should start at 1:00 but then continue for 7 hours into the evening, which the defendants oppose. A reasonable solution to this stand off is that the deposition be scheduled for two days starting at 1:00 p.m. each date, with the total deposition time not to exceed seven hours. That is the Court's ruling. Dated this 3rd day of August, 2012. Karen L. Strombom United States Magistrate Judge